

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application, and for the personal interview conducted on March 23, 2006. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action and interview, and it is respectfully submitted that the application, as amended, is patentable over the art of record. Reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

Claims 1–8 remain in this application. Claim 9 has been canceled. Claims 10-12 have been added. Claim 4 has been allowed.

Claims 1-2, and 7-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inoue *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,618,586) in view of Sone (U.S. 6,223,057). Claim 3 was rejected as above in further view of Kurosawa *et al.* (U.K. 2,331,890). Claims 5 and 6 were rejected as above in further view of Yasuda *et al.* (U.S. 5,062,132). For the following reasons, the Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1, as amended, recites an “interface means for connecting to an external memory device external to said terminal device for storing telephone numbers accessible by said device” and with a plurality of user selectable directories associated with the external memory device, wherein “wherein, a user can register a telephone number stored in the temporary storage memory in one of said user selectable directories selected from the plurality of user selectable telephone directories after making a call.”.

The Examiner cites Yasuda for teaching an external interface for connecting to an external memory. However, as admitted by the Examiner in the Office action, Yasuda merely teaches connecting two cell phones together to copy data manually entered into the memory of one unit to the memory of the other unit to avoid having to manually enter the data into the other

unit (see abstract, and col. 2, lines 8-12). The reference fails to teach any ability of the one unit to access telephone numbers stored in the other unit. This difference between the amended claims and the prior art was discussed at the personal interview, and the Examiner agreed that this argument appeared reasonable, and thus claim 1, as amended, appeared to overcome the references. Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over the references.

Claim 9 has been canceled, making its rejection moot.

New claim 10 recites an external memory having at least one of the user selectable directories for storing telephone numbers, and thus, as also discussed at the personal interview, is patentable over the references for at least the same reasons as claim 1. The remaining claims depend on at least one of the above discussed claims, and thus are patentable over the references for at least the same reasons as the parent claim(s).

Finally, there is no suggestion or motivation for one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the references to arrive at the claimed invention.

Instead, the Examiner relies on the benefit of the secondary reference or the feature as motivation for making the modification to the primary reference. This, of course, is not proper, because that would then make any reference self-motivating, and that is clearly not the law. Even if the Examiner's taking of Official Notice is proper, there must be some motivation for making the modification. Accordingly, the rejections for obviousness should be withdrawn.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

Appln. No. 09/595,204  
Amdt. Dated March 27, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of December 27, 2005

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge the same  
to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 32739.

Respectfully submitted,  
PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By: 

Robert F. Bodi – Reg. No. 48,540

1801 East 9th Street  
Suite 1200  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108  
(216) 579-1700

Date: March 27, 2006